

創価大学
国際仏教学高等研究所
年 報

平成29年度
(第21号)

Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University

for the Academic Year 2017

Volume XXI

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
東京・2018・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo・2018

Not *Bēnzhi*/*Bēnshí* (賁識, 奔識) but *Vaiśravaṇa*/*Kuvera* (毘沙門天) —Critical Review of Arlt/Hiyama’s Article on Gandharan Great Departure—

Katsumi TANABE

Introductory Remarks

In 2006 I published my doctoral thesis in Japanese: *The Origin of the Vaiśravaṇa Image* (毘沙門天像の起原), Sankibō-busshorin (山喜房佛書林), Tokyo. In this dissertation I identified the male figure (Fig. 1) holding a bow and an arrow depicted in Gandharan Great Departure (Fig. 2) as *Vaiśravaṇa* (毘沙門天). However, in 2007, Osamu Izumoji (出雲路修) of Ryukoku University, Kyoto published an article entitled “Hārītī is the wife of the Great God of the Five Paths (五道大神)” in which he maliciously criticized my identification of the aforesaid armed figure as *Vaiśravaṇa* and in its stead identified the male figure armed with a bow (and arrow) as the Great God (General) of the Five Paths (五道大神) named *Bēnzhi*/*Bēnshí* (賁識, 奔識) in Chinese.¹ He based his identification solely on the descriptions of this god narrated only in the three Chinese sutras: the *Foshuo taizi ruiying benqi jing* (仏説太子瑞應本起經, T3. 185), the *Yichu pusa benqi jing* (異出菩薩本記經, T3.188) and the *Foshuo pu yao jing* (仏説普曜經, T3. 186).² In a sense, his identification is well worth taking into account and publishing because it depends solely upon the two attributes of *Bēnzhi*/*Bēnshí*: a bow and an arrow without taking into consideration various types of male figures armed or unarmed in the Gandharan Great Departure. He kindly sent me a photocopy of his paper and therefore, I replied him that his identification was completely wrong and beside the mark after succinctly explaining why his identification is incorrect.

Four years later in June 2011, Seishi Karashima (辛嶋静志) of Soka University, Tokyo sent me an e-mail in which he kindly informed me that the Chinese expression *Bēnzhi*/*Bēnshí* *Benzhi* was a fanciful transliteration of *Vaiśramaṇa* (毘沙門天), a by-form of *Vaiśravaṇa*. He seemed to be inclined to identify the above-mentioned Gandharan armed figure (Fig. 1) as *Vaiśramaṇa*/*Bēnzhi*/*Bēnshí* described in the aforesaid three Chinese sutras. Therefore I informed him of a few reasons why such an identification as *Bēnzhi*/*Bēnshí* was hardly tenable from iconographical point of view. What is more, through his e-mail I happened to know that Juhyung Rhi (李柱亨) of Seoul National University had also attempted to identify the relevant armed figure as *Bēnzhi*/*Bēnshí* but he seemed to abandon it later.³

Since then, I had not encountered this identification as *Bēnzhi*/*Bēnshí* until at the beginning of January 2018 I happened to find the same wrong identification relying on the

1. Izumoji 2007: 81–86.

2. Izumoji 2007: 74–76, 82, 85.

3. Arlt/Hiyama 2016: 195, note 46, and 201, acknowledgements.

same wrong literary basis and misunderstanding as already put forward by Izumoji in 2007, in the newly-founded online journal, *Distant Worlds Journal*, Vol. 1 (2016). It is found in the article written by young coauthors: Robert Arlt, German and Satomi Hiyama (檜山智美), Japanese (infra abbreviated, Arlt/Hiyama) both of whom I have been acquainted with for several years. Then, I felt as if I was unexpectedly shot by a gunman and a gunwoman from behind at moonless night.

Anyhow, their so-called ‘New Evidence’ is no more than an enlarged repetition of misunderstanding already made by Izumoji around ten years ago. It is unfortunate that the article was published. However, in order to defend my thesis and also to prevent readers of the article from being misled into accepting a mistaken identification, I find it necessary to severely criticize the paper from the point of view of text criticism and iconographical analysis.⁴

1 Apocryphal Buddhist Scriptures

First, I will begin by clarifying that the relevant passages of the two Chinese ‘sutras’ of which both Izumoji and Arlt /Hiyama used for their identifications were probably fabricated and inserted by Chinese compilers in China. As regards the relevant passage of the *Foshuo pu yao jing* (仏説普曜經, dated 308 AD) I will exclude it from my discussion because the relevant passage (T3. 186. 507c) of this sutra is definitively of later interpolation made in China as Masaharu Arakawa and Kiyoshi Okano already demonstrated.⁵ What is more, the most reliable text of the Sanskrit *Lalitavistara*, one of the ‘original’ sutra of the *Foshuo pu yao jing*, recently revised and annotated by Kōichi Hokazono from several Sanskrit and Tibetan manuscripts, does not contain such a passage at all.⁶ The same holds true of another Chinese translation of the *Lalitavistara*, the *Fan guang da zhuangyan jing* (方廣大莊嚴經, T3. 187) translated by an Indian priest Divākara (地婆阿羅, Di Po He Luo) in 683. The text of the extant *Lalitavistara* was completed around 6th century AD and it is undoubtedly posterior to the *Foshuo pu yao jing* (仏説普曜經).⁷

From the above we might be allowed to assume that the relevant passage of the *Foshuo pu yao jing* did not exist in the original (lost) text of the *Lalitavistara* compiled in the north-west India or Gandhara by the second century AD at the latest.⁸ Therefore, the supposedly interpolated passage of this sutra should be better excluded from discussion of literary sources pertaining to the problem of *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí*.

Arlt/Hiyama’s identification depends upon the following two passages:

A Foshuo taizi ruiying benqi jing 仏説太子瑞應本起經 (T3. 185. 475c):

即起上馬。將車匿前行數十里。忽然見主五道大神。名曰賁識。最獨剛強。左執弓。右持箭。腰帶利劍。所居三道之衢。一曰天道。二曰人道。三曰三惡道。此所謂死者魂神。所當過見者也。太子到問。何道所從。賁識惶怖。投弓。積箭。解劍。逡巡示以天道曰。是道可從。(行數十里)。

4. Tanabe 1993/94, 1997.

5. Arakawa 2006: 516; Okano 1990: 260-261; cf. Karashima 2016: 115, notes 87, 92.

6. Hokazono 1997: 70, 82, 1998: 74–75, 86.

7. Okano 1990: 244; Hokazono 1994: 103.

8. Okano 1990: 265-264.

This passage narrates the Great Departure after the so-called the First Meditation (樹下觀耕) of the prince Siddhārtha conducted under the Jambu-tree and His Pessimistic View of Life, not after His Leave from Kapilavastu. Arlt/ Hiyama translated this passage as follows (pp. 190–191):

“After the prince had mounted Kaṇṭhaka, Candaka went ahead for several ten Li. (Then they suddenly saw the great god, who reigned over the five paths (主五道大神), by the name of Bēnzhi/Bēnshí (賁識), the single most powerful (of the gods). In his left and he held a bow, and in his right hand he had an arrow. At his waist he carried a sharp sword. He dwelled at an intersection of the three paths (所居三道之衢). The first is the path to the heaven(s). The second is the path to the human realm. The third are the three bad paths. This is the place, where spirits of the deceased pass and meet him. The prince asked him which path he should take. Bēnzhi/Bēnshí frightened and bashful, threw away the bow and arrow, untied his sword, hesitated and then pointed towards heaven (path), and said to go on this path” (underline mine).
(The prince advanced another several ten Li and encountered two hunters).

B Yichu pusa benqi jing 異出菩薩本記經 (T3. 188. 619b):

即上馬而去。行数十里。見一男子。名曰賁識。賁識者。鬼神中大神。為人剛慤。左手持弓。右手持箭。腰帶利劍。當道而立。賁識所立處者有三道。一者天道。二者人道。三者泥犁惡人之道。太子遙見。心為不樂。直以馬前趣之。賁識即惶怖戰慄。解劍持弓箭。却路而立。太子問曰。何道可從。賁識即以天道示之。此道可從。太子行数十里。道逢獵者。

This passage narrates almost the same story as the *Foshuo taizi ruiying benqi jing*. Arlt and Hiyama translated this passage as follows (pp. 191–192):

(After Siddhārtha’s First Meditation and His Pessimistic View of Life are described) “After the prince had ridden his horse for more than ten Li he saw a youth, named Bēnzhi/Bēnshí (賁識). Bēnzhi/Bēnshí was a great god among the demonic gods (鬼神中大神), appearing threatening to everyone. He held a bow in his left and, and an arrow in his right hand. At his waist he carried a sharp sword. He stood on the road. Where Bēnzhi/Bēnshí stood there are three paths. The first one is the path to the heaven(s). The second is the path to the human realm. The third is the path of the bad ones going to hell (泥犁 = Skt. *naraka*). He saw the prince from a distance and felt uncomfortable. When the prince’s horse stood directly in front of him, Bēnzhi/Bēnshí became scared and trembled. He loosened his sword and took the bow and arrow and remained standing on the path. The prince asked him which way he should go. Bēnzhi/Bēnshí immediately pointed to the heaven, (and said,) this is the path to go” (underline mine).
(The prince advanced another several ten Li and encountered hunters).

Before investigating the passages pertaining to the identification by Arlt/Hiyama, the problem must be examined whether the two relevant sutras quoted by them are valid for identification of the Gandharan Buddhist art. The supposed dates of the ‘translation’ (compilation, revision) of the two sutras are given as follows:

Foshuo taizi ruiying benqi jing 仏説太子瑞應本起經: from 222 to 253 AD translated by Zhi Qian (支謙)

Yichu pusa benqi jing 異出菩薩本起經: 280-313 AD translated by Nie Dao Zhen (攝道真)

The above-mentioned dates (3rd–4th centuries) seem to be almost contemporary with that of Gandharan sculpture. Therefore, we can use these two Chinese texts for identifying Gandharan iconography if they were undoubtedly translated from *Gandhārī* or Sanskrit texts that actually existed in Gandhara.

However, these dates are solely based upon the names of the so-called translators written in the texts and later Buddhist records, but are not proved by any concrete evidence. That is to say, the dates 222–253 AD and 280–313 AD are post-quam. We should keep in mind that the two relevant texts cannot be precisely dated and can merely be traced back to the 3rd–4th centuries AD.⁹ Therefore, these two Chinese sutras and the relevant passages may be posterior to the armed figure depicted in the Gandharan Great Departure scene. If this is the case, Izumoji's and Arlt/Hiyama's identification loses validity.

Next, it is now almost evident that these two sutras were not translated from the original Prākṛit (*Gandhārī*) or Sanskrit texts brought from Indian Subcontinent or Gandhara to China. According to Yūko Matsuda both are patchworks composed at least by two other lost sutras.¹⁰ She concludes rightly that it is doubtful that there was ever a Sanskrit text in the same format as the *Foshuo taizi ruiying benqi jing* (太子瑞應本起經). In my opinion, the same can be said of the *Yichu pusa benqi jing* (異出菩薩本起經) because both texts share a similar length, order, and story content.¹¹ What is more, Satoshi Kawano analyzed the content of the *Foshuo taizi ruiying benqi jing* in comparison with the *Xiuxing benqi jing* (修行本起經, T3. 184. 467c~468a) and the *Yichu pusa benqi jing*, and then concluded definitively the first part (上卷) of the *Foshuo taizi ruiying benqi jing* is mostly based on the original shorter sutra (lost) of the *Xiuxing benqi jing* translated into Chinese in 197 AD.¹² As far as my knowledge goes, no Buddhologist maintains and proves that these two 'sutras' are word-for-word translations from the Indic original texts and they once existed in India and Gandhara. In my opinion, both two passages on which Arlt/Hiyama's study depend are apparently apocryphal scriptures (疑經, 偽經) fabricated in China most probably by Chinese monks.¹³ This contention is acceptable if we read the story developed in these two sutras. We can easily notice that the plot before and after the Great Departure is not coherent but rather confused as Patricia Eichenbaum Karetzky already mentioned.¹⁴ The standard order of the episodes of the prince Siddhārtha after the First Meditation (1) (Fig. 3) is broadly arranged as follows:

Marriage (2), Palace Life (3), Four Encounters (4), Life of Ease in Palace and Renunciation (5), Great Departure (6) and Encounter with Hunters (7) and Farewell to Kaṇṭhaka and Candaka (8).¹⁵

Although in some sutras such as the *Xiuxing benqi jing* (修行本起經) and the *Saṅghabhedavastu of the Mūlasarvāstivādin's Vinaya* (根本說一切有部毘奈耶破僧事) the First Meditation (*prathama-dhyāna*, 初思慮 under the Jambu-tree seeing plowing) comes after the Four Encounters, such an arrangement of events does not affect our discussion.¹⁶

The problem lies in the fact that the *Foshuo taizi ruiying benqi jing* and the *Yichu pusa benqi jing* do not follow the above-mentioned order of episodes but mix up the order of events, and consequently put the First Meditation (1) after the Great Departure (6) not before.

⁹ Matsuda 1988: 487–489; Kawano 1991: 133–134; Nattier 2008: 10, 19, 135.

¹⁰ Matsuda 1988: 481–482, 485–486.

¹¹ Matsuda 1988: 480, 488.

¹² Kawano 1991: 163–165.

¹³ Oda 1976: 24.

¹⁴ Karetzky 1992: introduction, 72.

¹⁵ Foucher 1905: 340–368, 1949: 92–107; Hargreaves 1939: 13–21; Nakamura 1992: 153–204; Karetzky 1992: 51–80; Mori/Honzawa/Iwai 2000: 51–72.

¹⁶ T3. 184. 466b–467b; Gnoli 1977: 65–78; T. 24. 1450. 113c–114b.

More exactly speaking, the Great Departure splits into two parts (6-1, 6-2) between which is inserted the First Meditation (1). This split might be brought about by the compiler who got such an idea from the exceptional location of the First Meditation inserted just before the Great Departure of the *Xiuxing benqi jing* (修行本起經, T3. 184. 467b, c).

Anyhow, in the *Foshuo taizi ruiying benqi jing* and the *Yichu pusa benqi jing* the first of the Great Departure (6-1) is followed by the First Meditation (1) after which the second departure from the Royal Field (6-2) takes place. The *Foshuo taizi ruiying benqi jing* says as follows:

夜其過半...即呼車匿...天王...久知其意。即使鬼神。捧拳馬足。并接車匿。踰出宮城。到於王田閻浮樹下。...王因自到田上。遙見太子。坐於樹下... (樹下觀耕) ...即起上馬。將車匿前行数十里。忽然見主五道神。名曰賁識。

After midnight the prince Siddhārtha called the groom named Candaka and riding the horse Kaṇṭhaka advanced to the gate. Then, the Four Lokapālas (四天王) having known the intention of the prince ordered the *yakṣas* to hold the legs (hooves) of Kaṇṭhaka and made the prince on horseback and Candaka cross over the city-gate. From there they advanced and arrived at the foot of the Jambu tree (閻浮樹) in the Royal Field... (The next day) King Śuddhodana found the prince meditating under the Jambu tree... (The prince saw plowing and indulged in the First Meditation)... (On the same day) the prince stood up and rode Kaṇṭhaka, and accompanied by Candaka proceeded several ten Li and unexpectedly saw the God (General) of the Five Paths named *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí* (my translation, T3. 185. 475b, c).

The *Yichu pusa benqi jing* says as follows:

太子馬行...四天王。即使諸鬼神。抱持馬足。踰屋出城。自到王家佃上。止樹下。...王即自到佃舍。遙見太子坐樹下。... (樹下觀耕) ...即馬而去。行数十里。見一男子。名曰賁識。

The prince Siddhārtha advanced riding the horse Kaṇṭhaka... Four Lokapālas made *yakṣas* hold the legs (hooves) of the horse Kaṇṭhaka and the prince flew over the city-gate and left Kapilavastu. Arriving in the Royal Field the prince stopped under the Jambu tree... (The next day) King Śuddhodana arrived at a pavilion in the Royal field and found the prince sitting under the Jambu tree... (The prince was looking at plowing while sitting in the First Meditation)... Then, (on the same day) the prince rode the horse Kaṇṭhaka and left the Royal Field. When they advanced several ten Li, the prince found a man named *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí* (my translation, T3. 188. 619b).

More than thirty of the Buddha's Life Stories found in the *Nidānakathā*, *Buddhacarita*, *Mahāvastu*, *Lalitavistara*, *Saṅghabhedavastu* and Chinese translations do not mention the above-quoted split of the Great Departure nor the God (General) of the Five Paths.¹⁷ As standard Life Story of the Buddha does not insert the First Meditation between the two episodes of departure, the Great Departure splitting into two independent events is quite irregular and unreasonable.¹⁸ Such an irregularity and exception lead us to regard that the aforesaid two sutras are of Chinese fabrication rather than translation from Indic original text. This assumption might be corroborated by a few Gandharan relief panels (Fig. 4) that depict continuously both the Great Departure and Farewell to Kaṇṭhaka and Candaka or the Exchange of Clothes.¹⁹ No extant Gandharan relief panel depicts the First Meditation side by side with the Great Departure.

¹⁷ Mori/Honzawa/Iwai 2000: 66–69; Gnoli 1977.

¹⁸ Foucher 1905: 340–348, figs. 175, 176.

¹⁹ Foucher 1905: 361–367, figs. 184, 187; Hargreaves 1939: 19–20, fig. XIX; Ingholt 1957: 61, fig. 48; Karetzky 1992: 242, fig. 39; Yasuda 2000: 17, fig. 20–9; Ueeda 2016: 158, no.10. Tanabe/Maeda 1999: fig. 8.

Especially, the passage pertaining to the episode of *Bēnzhī/Bēnshí* is quite odd and incongruous. The Five Paths are concerned only with five postmortem destinations of humans (*naraka*, *tiryagyoni*, *preta*, *manuṣya* and *deva*) and *saṃsāra* (輪廻転生, endless transmigration), but not with the Enlightenment and *Nirvāṇa* for which Siddhārtha renounced luxurious palace life and made the Great Departure. Therefore, there is no room for the God of the Five Paths to intervene in Siddhārtha's Renunciation.

What is more, the Sanskrit or Indic word equivalent and corresponding to 五道(大)神 (the God of the Five Paths) is not attested so far not only in Indic Buddhist scripture but also in Sanskrit-English, Sanskrit-German and Pāli-English dictionaries as far as I know. For example, the *Zeng yi a han jing* 增一阿含經 (T2. 125. 700a, b) describes the name of 五道大神, but in the Pāli *Āṅguttara-Nikāya* corresponding to this Chinese sutra (tr. 384–85 AD) that name cannot be found at all as far as its extant parts are concerned.²⁰ Therefore, the existence of the God of the Five Paths in Indian Buddhism is highly doubtful as Arlt/Hiyama also admit.²¹ In other words, the God of the Five Paths is no more than a 'mirage' or ghost appearing only in Chinese sutras. Eventually, these two doubtful sutras, the *Foshuo taizi ruiying benqi jing* and the *Yichu pusa benqi jing* require validation of Indian authorship and assurance of their historicity when employed for academic research of Gandharan art.²² However, until now this requirement has not been fulfilled by scholars with expertise in Buddhism.

From all the above, it can be said that the passages quoted by Arlt/Hiyama must have been interpolated by the so-called translators or compilers in order to propagate teachings of the *saṃsāra* and the Five Paths (五趣) especially for the Chinese Buddhists and the lay public who did not know these Indian concepts. Arakawa and Bulcsu Siklós presumed in the same way as regards the similar interpolation in the *Foshuo pu yao jing* (仏説普曜經).²³

In my opinion, the insertion of the relevant passages might have been inspired by one *gāthā* (偈) appearing in the *Xiuxing benqi jing* (修行本起經, T3. 184. 468a) where the prince Siddhārtha declares that life and death have lasted a very long time (*saṃsāra*) and men's spirits have repeated incarnation along the Five Paths (生死為久長 精神經五道), just before he leaves the gate of palace.²⁴ The expression of Five Paths (五道) is found in several lines of the Great Departure chapter of the second volume of this sutra.²⁵ The *Xiuxing benqi jing* or its older and shorter version was regarded by Kawano as the original text of the first volume of the *Foshuo taizi ruiying benqi jing* (太子瑞應本起經).²⁶ On the other hand, the Five Paths (五道) were exactly translated from Pāli or Sanskrit *pañcagati*, *pañca gatiyaḥ*, *pañca gatika* etc. (五道).²⁷ The Pāli *Majjhima-Nikāya*, Vol. I, page 73 and the *Āṅguttara-Nikāya*, Vol. IV, page 459 mention that word (*pañca gatiyaḥ*) and each of the Five Paths.²⁸ However, the God of the Five Paths is not mentioned.

20. Hunt 1910.

21. Arlt/Hiyama 2016: 195–196.

22. Teiser 1994: 63.

23. Arakawa 2006: 516, 519. Siklós 1996:180.

24. T3. 184. 468a; Karetzky 1992: 71.

25. T3. 184. 469b, c, 470a, b, 471a, c; Oda 1997: 16.

26. Kawano 1991: 164–165.

27. Hirakawa 1997: 89.

28. Trencner 1888:73; Hardy 1899: 459; Lamotte 1958: 34.

Besides, it is almost certain that *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí* derived from the word *pañca* (五道).²⁹ At first glance, Izumoji seems to be right in proposing that *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí* is perceived as identical with Pāñcika.³⁰ It is true that the Sanskrit word *pañca* reminds us of Pāñcika or Pāñcika, the husband of a Yakṣṇī Hārītī as Glen Dudbride and Izumoji supposed.³¹ In 2016 Karashima proposed that *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí* is likely the Chinese phonetic translation of Pāñcika.³² Therefore, it is now nearly certain that *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí* is Pāñcika (般闍鬼將軍, 半祁鬼神, 般遮迦). However, even if Karashima's identification is correct from the phonetic point of view, contrary to the assertion of Dudbride and Izumoji, the Chinese *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí* (賁識, 奔識) is not the same Pāñcika who is a Yakṣa in Gandharan depictions and the husband of Hārītī. The Indian and Gandharan Pāñcika is not associated with the Guardian of the Five Paths nor with the Guide for the postmortem destinations of the deceased Buddhists, but is confined to dispenser of riches.³³ This is best demonstrated by the fact that the literary image of Pāñcika as *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí* is apparently different from that of Gandharan Pāñcika/Pharro/Kuvera who is not depicted holding a bow, an arrow and a sword but a lance, spear or staff (and a purse). He is often accompanied by Hārītī/Ardoxsho and an infant or boys (Figs. 5, 6).³⁴ The lance or spear held by Pāñcika probably symbolizes his role as General (*senapati*) of Yakṣas who in Buddhist scriptures are said to be heavily armed, and probably does not derive from the lance or staff held by Pharro depicted in Kushan coins and seals.³⁵ In any case, the iconography of Gandharan Pāñcika/Pharro/Kuvera (Figs. 5, 6) was so well established in Gandhara that the Gandharan Buddhists could easily distinguish Pāñcika/Pharro/Kuvera from the male figure armed with a bow and an arrow (Fig. 1). That means the relevant armed figure is not *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí*/Pāñcika at all.

The reason why Chinese compilers of the *Foshuo taizi ruiying benqi jing* (太子瑞應本起經) and the *Yichu pusa benqi jing* (異出菩薩本起經) inserted the First Meditation between the first Great Departure and the Encounters with *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí* might be found in their strong intention to introduce and include the General of the Five Paths (五道大神) in the sutras that they compiled. Probably they took up the relevant passage of the First Meditation and fabricated its shorter version to be inserted or 'transplanted' after the Great Departure. This is quite evident just if we compare the First Meditation in the *Xiuxing benqi jing* (修行本起經) translated in 197 AD with those in the above two Chinese sutras.³⁶ It is clear that the content of the First Meditation of the *Xiuxing benqi jing* corresponds to those narrated in other sutras.³⁷

From the above considerations one can understand that the identification of *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí* as Gandharan Pāñcika is beside the mark and that it is wrong to make use of the

^{29.} Dudbridge 1996/97: 87, 2005: 242; Arakawa 2006: 516; Zheng 2009: 4, 2013: 188.

^{30.} Izumoji 2007: 77.

^{31.} Dudbride 1996/97: 87; Izumoji 2007: 76–78.

^{32.} Karashima 2016: 114–115.

^{33.} Foucher 1918: 103, 106, 111–120.

^{34.} Foucher 1918: 102–162, figs. 364, 367, 369, 370, 371, 382, 383, 385, 386, 387; Bachhofer 1937: Taf.3-figs.1–3; John 2003: 427, figs.2–5; Quagliotti 2003: figs.1–2, 5, 9, 24, 33, 37, 43, 2005: figs.1–8.

^{35.} Rosenfield 1967: 96–98, fig. 13, pl. IX-nos.169–181; Göbl 1984: pl. 171-Pharro 1–12; Callieri 1997: pl.19-Cat.7.1, 59–Cat. U 7. 11; Tanabe 1999/2000: 120, figs. 1, 6–9; Rahman/Falk 2011: 103, figs. 07. 05. 01, 104, 07. 05. 06–09, 105, figs. 07. 05. 10–13, 107, fig. 07. 06.14; Cribb 2015: 281–282.

^{36.} T3. 184. 467b, 185. 475b, c, 188. 619b.

^{37.} T3. 186. 499a, 187. 560b, 189. 629a, 190. 705c, T24. 1450. 117a, and the *Lalitavistara* ch. 11.

aforesaid two Chinese passages without textual criticism in order to identify the armed figure holding a bow (and arrow) depicted in the Great Departure of Gandhara.

2 Misconceptions of Chinese Textual Description

Arlt/Hiyama made an unfortunate error in the English translation of the Chinese character 箭 (arrows). They translated 箭 into ‘an arrow’ in both sutras (refer to the above underlined two Chinese texts and English translations and the *Foshuo puyao jing* (仏説普曜經, T3. 186. 507c). However, this word should be translated into plural ‘arrows’ or ‘a bundle of arrows’. Although it is true that the Chinese character 箭 means both singularly ‘an arrow’ and plurally ‘arrows’, but as far as the relevant passage is concerned, it must be translated into ‘arrows’ or ‘a bundle of arrows’. Karetzky, Dudbridge and Karashima correctly translated 箭 into ‘arrows’.³⁸ In antiquity the archer, whether hunter or soldier, who is armed with a bow carries a quiver in which are usually inserted a bundle of arrows, never only one arrow. It seems that Arlt/Huiyama translated, carelessly or intentionally, 箭 into an arrow in order to adjust it to the Gandharan male figure holding an arrow (Figs. 1, 7). Probably, Arlt/Hiyama did not pay any attention to shooting male figures or princes depicted in Achaemenian, Scythian, Parthian, Kushan and Sasanian arts.³⁹ If they knew the archer or cavalier equipped with a quiver, they would not have made such a crucial error. Even if the cavalier or archer is depicted without quiver (Fig. 8), he can still hold a few arrows in the left hand and attempt to shoot an arrow.

In the light of the above revised translation of 箭, Arlt/Hiyama’s assertion to the effect that “at least from the description of his behavior and appearance, holding a bow and arrow (in the exact same hands as in text and art) and wearing a sword, the correspondence between the representation and the literary sources seems evident in this case”⁴⁰ is hardly tenable.

To the contrary, it can be definitively concluded that the male figure (Figs. 1, 7) holding an arrow in addition to a bow depicted in Great Departure relief panels of Gandhara cannot be identified at all as *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí* who is described to hold a bundle of arrows or a quiver containing many arrows.

In passing, I must confess that it is very difficult to determine the reason why Vaiśravaṇa carries a bow and an arrow.⁴¹ One solution might be that Vaiśravaṇa was assumed by Gandharan Buddhists to carry these arms as is suggested in the Conception/Dream of Queen Māyā episode in the Chinese translation of the *Sanṅhabhedavastu* (根本說一切有部毘奈耶破僧事). The chapter two of this sutra runs as follows:

When the Siddhārtha descended into the womb of his mother Māyā, Indra ordered the Four Lokapālas (四天王) to guard the mother. Each of them is armed with one weapon: first one (*Dhṛtarāṣṭra*) with a sword, the second (*Virūḍhaka*) with a kind of rope, the third (*Virūpākṣa*) with a javelin and the fourth (*Vaiśravaṇa*) with a bow and arrows (四天王神營衛其母。而此四

³⁸. Karetzky 1992: 72; Dudbridge 1996/97: 88, 2005: 241; Karashima 2016: 114–115.

³⁹. Wilcox/McBride 1986: 7, 8, 18, 22, 23, 40, 41, 46, pls. B, D-H; Rickenbach 1989: 50, fig. 22; Nicolle/McBride 1996: 7, 8, 11, 12, 16, 18, 22, 60, 65, pls. A, C, E-G.

⁴⁰. Arlt/Hiyama 2016: 197.

⁴¹. Tanabe 2006: 113–122. Cf. The most resembling image to *Vaiśravaṇa* of this type is the Greek god Apollon holding a bow and an arrow depicted on bronze coin issued by Apollodotos I Soter (180-160 BC) of Indo-Greek Kingdom. Bopearachchi 1991: pls. 12-14. Apollon is the god of archery and light (Sun god). Bow and arrow may symbolize light flashing over the pitch-dark road at midnight.

神一執利刀。一執羂索。一執於戟。一執弓箭、T24. 1450. 107b, c) (my translation).⁴²

In the *Saṅghabhedavastu* the corresponding passage of the above is described slightly differently and does not mention clearly a bow and arrows. It runs as follows:

Śakro devendraś caturo devaputrān mātur āraśakān sthāpayaty asihastān, prāsahastāṃś, chakti-hastān tomarahastān.

(Indra told the Four Lokapālas to stay there guarding the Mother of Siddhārtha, one Lokapāla holding in the hand a sword, the other Lokapāla a javelin (arrow?), another Lokapāla a spear (bow ?) and the fourth Lokapāla (*Vaiśravaṇa*) a lance (my translation).⁴³

The *Lalitavistara* says that each of the Four Lokapālas hold a sword or an arrow or a javelins/ bow (?) or a dagger (*asidhanuśaraśaktikhadgahastāḥ*) (my translation; Hokazono 1994: 372), but the *Foshuo pu yao jing* (仏説普曜經 T3. 186. 490b) does not mention any weapon.

Another solution might be found in the description of the *Lalitavistara* chapter fifteen (*Abhiniṣkramaṇa-parivartaḥ*) to the effect that *Vaiśravaṇa*'s army (*yakṣas*) is equipped with all kinds of weapon such as bow, sword, arrow, spear, disk, a kind of rope and so forth.⁴⁴ Following this description, bow and arrow can be seen to symbolize that *Vaiśravaṇa* is the lord of *yakṣas*. This symbolism is able to explain a bow and an arrow held by Gandharan *Vaiśravaṇa* image.

In any case, it is almost impossible to clarify the definitive and particular reason why *Vaiśravaṇa* has weapons solely relying on the extant Buddhist sutras. Probably, it might be rather attributed to the original idea and creation of Gandharan sculptors to add weapons to *Vaiśravaṇa* image regardless of Buddhist scripture.

Next, Arlt/Hiyama do not seem to understand the significance of disarmament of *Bēnzhi*/*Bēnshí* when he encountered the prince Siddhārtha. The *Foshuo taizi ruiying benqi jing* (仏説太子瑞應本起經) describes that when Siddhārtha asked him the way to take he was extremely frightened and threw away the bow and arrows and 'removed the sword and sword-belt from the waist' (責識惶怖。投弓。釈箭。解劍, T3. 185. 475c). The *Foshuo pu yao jing* (仏説普曜經) also narrates that when *Bēnzhi*/*Bēnshí* recognized Siddhārtha coming towards him he threw away the bow and arrows and 'took away the sword and sword-belt from the waist', and retreated to the side of the road (見菩薩來。釈弓投箭解劍退住, T3. 186. 507c). Arlt/Hiyama translated the Chinese expression 解劍 into 'untied his sword' and 'loosened his sword', but it actually means that a belt suspending a sword by scabbard slide (Fig. 9) was untied and removed from the waist of *Bēnzhi*/*Bēnshí*.⁴⁵

On the other hand, as regards the sword held by *Bēnzhi*/*Bēnshí*, the *Yichu pusa benqi jing* (異出菩薩本記經) says that *Bēnzhi*/*Bēnshí* was immediately terrified and shivered: he removed his sword and sword-belt from the waist (解劍) but still held a bow and arrows (責識即惶怖戰慄。解劍持弓箭, T3. 188. 619b). The Chinese word 持 (held) turns out to be a scribe's or copyist's error compared with the aforesaid passages of the *Foshuo taizi ruiying*

⁴². As for the directional order from the East to North of the Four Lokapālas, especially the fourth Lokapāla *Vaiśravaṇa*, Tanabe 1993/94: 163, 2006: 51-54; Sadakata 2002: 119-118.

⁴³. Gnoli 1977: 42.

⁴⁴. Foucaux 1884: 192; Hokazono 1997: 76; cf. Tanabe 1993/94: 175.

⁴⁵. In antiquity of China and Central Asia, scabbard-slide was generally used. Trousdale 1975: 11-108, figs. 20-31 (China), 46-64 (Pakistan and Afghanistan); Göbl 1984: diagram VII.

benqi jing and the *Foshuo pu yao jing*. It is meaningless and senseless that *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí* throws away only the sword but still keeps carrying his bow and arrows when he surrenders and shows allegiance to the visitor Siddhārtha. According to the above-quoted relevant Chinese descriptions, *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí* laid down all his arms (bow, arrows and sword) as if he surrendered unconditionally as soon as he confronted the prince Siddhārtha on horseback.

These descriptions of disarmament of *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí* are not in harmony with the armed figure (Figs. 1, 7, 10) depicted in the Great Departure scene of Gandhara. To the best of my knowledge, there are at least four relief panels known that depicts a unarmed male figure in the Great Departure: one panel from Kunduz or northern Afghanistan represents lamellar-armoured *Vaiśravaṇa* wearing a pair of wings on the head and standing in front of Siddhārtha and showing him the way without bow, arrow and sword. Other panels from Lorian Tangai and Swat depict wearing an Indian princely dress.⁴⁶

However, these are exceptional and their disarmament can be explained from the description of the Great Departure in the sutras where *Vaiśravaṇa* is not described carrying weapon at all.⁴⁷

What is more, there are at least three Gandharan relief panels that depict a male figure without bow and arrow but holding only a sword (Fig. 11) showing the way by the right hand (Indian Museum, Kolkata, Si. no. 283, Acc. No. 5045/A23428 and Swat Museum, Inv. no. 2892).⁴⁸ Therefore, the Gandharan male figure was sometimes depicted without bow and arrow.

Anyhow, the above-quoted three passages should not be used as textual source for identifying Gandharan imagery. Furthermore, the relevant Gandharan male figure armed with a bow and an arrow should not be identified as *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí*.

3 Contradictions between the Gandharan Iconography and Chinese Literary Description

First, I mention that the male figure armed with a bow (and an arrow) depicted in the Great Departure relief panels of Gandhara often wears a cuirass or plate mail armour (Figs. 7, 10) while in the aforesaid three Chinese sutras *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí* is not described wearing a cuirass or armour. Therefore, this discrepancy favours and supports the view that the armoured figure (Figs. 7, 10) holding a bow and an arrow in the Gandharan Great Departure scene is not derived from what is written in the Chinese sources and eventually has nothing to do with *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí*. In my opinion, the armour of the male figure might have been influenced by that worn by Pharro depicted on Huviška's gold coins in the collection of the American Numismatic Society⁴⁹ or, more probably by the armoured portrait of Kushan king Vasudeva (Fig. 12).

⁴⁶ Fischer 1958: 238-239, panel III-fig. 4; Foucher 1905: 184a; Kurita 2003: 29, fig. 27; Tanabe/Maeda 1999: 12, fig. 8; Faccenna 1964: 129, pl. CDXI; Nara National Museum 1987: pl. 3; Yūrinkan 1996: pl. 18; Tanabe 2006: 100-101, figs. 44, 51, 55; cf. Dani 1968/89: pl. 35-b; Mizuno/Higuchi 1978: pl. 104-4; Jongeward 2003: 85, pl. 18; Kurita 2003: 68, fig. 134.

⁴⁷ Tanabe 1993/94: 173-175.

⁴⁸ Foucher 1905: 359, fig. 183; Faccenna 1985: 330, pl. III; Tanabe/Maeda 1999: 146, fig. 109; Maeda 2014: 14, fig. 1.

⁴⁹ Carter 1993: fig. 12; Tanabe 1999/2000: 120, fig. 8; Yongeward/Cribb 2015: pl. 23-nos. 773, 774.

Second, the male figure armed with a bow (and an arrow) in Gandharan Great Departure scene shows the way to Siddhārtha by the right hand (Fig. 13) or by an arrow (Figs. 1, 7) grasped by the right hand. No concrete gesture of *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí* is mentioned in the three relevant Chinese sutras. Therefore, the gesture of the armed figure in the Gandharan Great Departure scene is not visualized from what is described in the relevant Chinese sources. Both hand and arrow gestures probably derived from the function of *Vaiśravaṇa/Kuvera* as Guide of Siddhārtha as I already demonstrated in my dissertation.⁵⁰

Third, both the *Foshuo taizi ruiying benqi jing* (仏説太子瑞應本起經) and the *Yichu pusa benqi jing* (異出菩薩本起經) do not mention that the *yakṣas* supported the hooves or legs of the horse Kaṇṭhaka when Siddhārtha left the Royal Field after the First Meditation under the Jambu tree.⁵¹ It means that Kaṇṭhaka was not supported by *yakṣas* when Siddhārtha on horseback met *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí*. On the contrary, in the Great Departure of Gandhara Kaṇṭhaka is, as a rule, represented supported by *yakṣas*. This discrepancy tells us clearly that Kaṇṭhaka supported by *yakṣas* is undoubtedly the representation of the first departure from Kapilavastu as is mentioned above (supra, p. 427). Needless to say, both Chinese sutras describe that the *yakṣas* supported the hooves or legs of Kaṇṭhaka when Siddhārtha departed from Kapilavastu for the first time, i.e., in the ‘first’ Great Departure before the First Meditation (Fig. 4) under the Jambu tree (閻浮樹) (supra, p. 427). The reason why *yakṣas* held the hooves or legs of Kaṇṭhaka is to ensure that no noise would be noticed by the guards of the gate of Kapilavastu. On the contrary, when Siddhārtha left the Royal Field after the First Meditation under the Jambu tree, such a conduct of *yakṣas* was not necessary.

In any case, if the male figure were *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí*, we cannot explain the reason why *yakṣas* are depicted in the Great Departure scene. The same holds true of the Nagaradevatā and city-gate of Kapilavastu depicted in the Great Departure. *Yakṣas*, Nagaradevatā and city-gate are associated with the first departure but not with the second one after the First Meditation under the Jambu tree.

Fourth, a pair of wings worn by *Vaiśravaṇa* in the Donation of Four Bowls (Fig. 14) and the Great Departure (Figs. 1, 2, 7, 10) must be investigated. As I already proved, this winged headdress derives from the pair of wings on the head of the Kushan god Pharro (Fig. 15) struck on the coins issued by Kaniška I and Huviška.⁵² This is a visual representation of *Xvarnah* (royal glory, fortune etc.) of Zoroastrianism. With regard to this unique motif, Arlt/Hiyama attempts to relate it to one of the attributes of *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí* on the basis of a 10th–11th centuries AD painting of the General of the Five Paths (五道將軍) and a Dunhuang manuscript. They propose this in order to make *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí* derive from Māra, personified Death or tempter,⁵³ in spite of the fact that *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí* is not described as wearing a winged headdress. In my opinion the attempt to relate the pair of wings to Māra⁵⁴ is out of question because in all the images of Māra as far as Gandharan and Indian Buddhist relief panels are concerned,⁵⁵ Māra does not wear a pair of wings but rather a turban.

^{50.} Tanabe 2006: 184–86, 05-107, figs. 47, 51, 55, 68, 59.

^{51.} T3. 185. 475c, 188. 619b.

^{52.} Tanabe 1993/94: 164, fig. 6, 2006: 125–132, figs. 16, 67–68.

^{53.} Arlt/Hiyama 2016: 196–200, fig. 5.

^{54.} Arlt/Hiyama 2016: 198–200.

^{55.} Foucher 1918: 197–202, figs. 402-404; Coomaraswamy 1956: 43–44, pls. VIII-fig.23, IX-fig. 26 Ingholt 1957: figs. 62, 63, 66 ; Kurita 2003: figs. 217–220, 227, 228, 230, 235.

In my view, the image of the General of the Five Paths illustrated by Art/Hiyama⁵⁶ does not appear to wear a pair of wings but an ear-guard attached to helmet. Even if he wears a pair of wings as Arlt/Hiyama propose, such a late painting of medieval China together with Dunhuang literary evidence of Tang period does not necessarily prove that *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí* wears a winged headdress. In my opinion there is no particular relationship between *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí* appearing in the aforesaid three Chinese sutras and a pair of wings sometimes worn by Gandharan *Vaiśravaṇa/Pharro/Pañcika* images (Figs. 1, 2, 7, 10.).⁵⁷ The history of winged headdress or winged headgear in China might go back to the latter half of the 5th century AD of the Northern Wei Dynasty.⁵⁸ Since then it was diffused so widely that it was later unrestrictedly applied to *Vajrapāṇi*, *Vaiśravaṇa* (多聞天), *deva*, demigod, and guardian-deity etc. as Hiyama herself knows well.⁵⁹ Probably a pair of wings was used as a generic ornament of helmet without any particular symbolic meaning in medieval China.

Fifth, another unfortunate error to the identifications by Izumoji and Arlt/Hiyama is found in the fact that they paid no attention to the description of the daytime encounter of Siddhārtha with *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí*. If we read the passage of the First Meditation in both the *Foshuo taizi ruiying benqi jing* (仏説太子瑞応本起經) and the *Yichu pusa benqi jing* (異出菩薩本記經), it is clear that in the daytime Siddhārtha is meditating after seeing plowed fields (見耕者, 見田中犁者).⁶⁰ On realizing the misery and vanity of this world he again rode Kaṇṭhaka and advanced. These two sutras do not mention that he departed from the Royal Field at night.

Contrary to such a daytime event, all the sutras say that the Great Departure took place at midnight, and Gandharan Great Departure relief panels represents undoubtedly the midnight episode of Siddhārtha. This is evident on several relief panels of the Great Departure scene in depictions of the Goddess of Night, *Rātrī* (Figs. 1, 2, 10–13) holding scarf or veil (*velificatio*, symbol of night sky) above the head.⁶¹ Therefore, if the armed male figure represents *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí*, it is absolutely impossible to explain the reason why the Goddess of Night is often depicted in the Great Departure. What is more, the Great Departure took place at midnight. That is the reason why a guide was needed for showing the proper way to Siddhārtha in the pitch-dark darkness.

Lastly, it is necessary to take into consideration the mode of visual narrative of the relief panels pertaining to the Great Departure. In ancient India the sculptors attempted to depict a few episodes in one scene. This method of visual narrative is called ‘continuous narrative (異時同図)’.⁶² This method was used for depicting Gandharan *Mahāparinirvāṇa*, *Viśvantara-jātaka*, *Dīpaṃkara-jātaka* and so on.⁶³ If Gandharan sculptors adopted continuous narrative, the Gandharan Great Departure may represent thrice continuously, Siddhārtha on horseback leaving Kapilavastu (I), the First Meditation under the Jambu tree (II) and the Meeting with

⁵⁶. Art/Hiyama 2016: 195, fig. 5.

⁵⁷. Dagens/ Le Berre/Schlumberger 1964: pl. V-fig. 9; Giès/Cohen 1995: 238, fig. 183.

⁵⁸. Cf. 雲崗石窟 Yün-kan Caves, Nagahiro 1976: Text, plan 14, Plates, pl. 182, color pls. 24, 30; Ikawa 1986: 76–78, figs. 88, 91.

⁵⁹. Hiyama 2013: 130, figs. 912; Kageyama 2007: 1–14, Tables 2, 3; Dainobu 1992: pls. 36, 107, 114–124.

⁶⁰. T3. 185. 475c, 188. 619b.

⁶¹. Tanabe 1997/98: 213–219, figs. 1–3, 10–13, 2006: 234–257, figs. 33–1, 34–1~2, 47, 120, 129–131, 133, 134.

⁶². Dehejia 1997: 3–27, figs. 17a–21.

⁶³. Tanabe 2016: 76–81, figs. 1, 17, 20–22. Ingholt 1957: figs. 7, 138, 139, 141. Dehejia 1997: 25, fig. 19.

Bēnzhi/Bēnshí who shows him the way (III). That is to say, Siddhārtha involved in three episodes (I, II, III) must be continuously depicted three times in a relief panel. However, he is always represented only once (I). In case his horse Kaṇṭhaka is not supported by a *yakṣa* or *yakṣas*, Siddhārtha can be understood to be represented twice on horseback representing both the Great Departure (II) and the Meeting with *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí* (III). However, this is not the case because the depiction of *yakṣa(s)* is often missing in Gandharan sculpture. Even without *yakṣa(s)* the horse Kaṇṭhaka is intimately related to the gate of Kapilavastu, not with the Five Paths. In any case, following the principle of ‘continuous narrative’, the First Meditation (Fig. 3) always depicted by the image of the Buddha sitting must be inserted in the scene of the Great Departure, but actually is not represented nor suggested in Gandharan Great Departure relief panels known to us. Eventually, we can assume that ‘continuous narrative’⁶⁴ was not applied to the Great Departure of Gandhara. In other words, Siddhārtha’s Meeting *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí* (II) is not represented at all in the Gandharan Great Departure.

Concluding remarks

Taking all the above refutations into consideration, it can be best concluded that there is no room for identifying the armed male figure in the Great Departure of Gandhara (Figs. 1, 6, 8, 10, 11) as *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí*.

Arlt/Hiyama’s article does not present any useful new evidence for the identification and the two relevant Chinese sutras were already vainly introduced to us by Izumoji ten years ago. Arlt/Hiyama’s presents many interesting and useful preceding studies but their argument is evidently beside the mark and gives us nothing convincing. Our textual and iconographical investigation convinces us that the episode of *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí* described only in the three Chinese sutras has nothing to do with the Great Departure of Gandhara. I have shown that there is no Gandharan relief panel which depicts the General (God) of the Five Paths and *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí*. This is contrary to the Arlt/Hiyama’s conclusion that “the figure with a bow, which is standing in front of the prince on his horse, can be identified as the deity, called *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí* and is described as the god of the five paths.”⁶⁵ What is more, another of their conclusions that “from an art-historical point of view, the figure with a bow in Gandharan art can be understood as *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí* ‘the God of the Five Paths’ mentioned in three early Chinese translations”⁶⁶ cannot be acceptable either. Both their conclusions might be perceived as *argumentum ex silentio*.

At the end of their conclusion, Arlt/Hiyama proudly declare that “the authors hope that this study brings a fresh perspective and will inspire future studies of Gandharan art,”⁶⁷ but their declaration sounds like a remarkable but vain joke.

Lastly I close my review by an additional remark that as the episode of *Bēnzhi/Bēnshí* is decisively of Chinese fabrication and interpolation, the *Foshuo taizi ruiying benqi jing* (仏説太子瑞應本起經) and the *Yichu pusa benqi jing* (異出菩薩本記經) may be no more than apocryphal scriptures (疑經, 偽經) compiled in China.

^{64.} Dehejia 1997: 21–27, figs. 16–21. Behrendt 2004: 383–391, figs. 1a–5.

^{65.} Arlt/Hiyama 2016: 193.

^{66.} Arlt/Hiyama 2016: 200.

^{67.} Arlt/Hiyama 2016: 200.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the editors Noriyuki Kudo and Seishi Karashima for accepting my review article that I abruptly asked them to publish in this journal. I am grateful also to David Jongeward (Toronto, Kanada) for correcting and improving my English. Needless to say, all faults and shortcomings are mine.

Abbreviations

T: *Taishō-shinshū-daizō-kyō* (大正新脩大藏經), ed. by Junjirō Takakusu and Kaikyoku Watanabe, 100 vols., Tokyo: Taishō Issai-kyō Kankōkai, 1924–1934

Sources of Illustrations

- Fig. 1. Courtesy of J. Bautze
- Fig. 2. Author's photo
- Fig. 3. Nimogram: Pakistan Archaeological Site Images (internet)
- Fig. 4. Courtesy of late M. Kurisu
- Fig. 5. Tanabe/Maeda 1999: pl.128
- Fig. 6. Author's photo
- Fig. 7. Courtesy of E. Uehara
- Fig. 8. R. Ghirshman, *Parthes et Sassanides*, Gallimard, Paris, 1962, Paris, fig. 340
- Fig. 9. Senoku hakukokan, *Gandharan Art and Silk Road Painting*, in Japanese, Kyoto, 1990, pl. 31
- Fig. 10. Courtesy of E. Uehara
- Fig. 11. Tanabe /Maeda 1999: fig. 109
- Fig. 12. Courtesy of the British Museum
- Fig. 13. Courtesy of T. Tanabe
- Fig. 14. Courtesy of the Hirayama Ikuo Silk Road Museum
- Fig. 15. Author's photo

Select Bibliography

- Arakawa, M. 2006. "Lay-Buddhists and the Great God of the Five Paths in Northern Dynasty, Zui and Early Tang China." In *Crossroads of Sinology* (文明の十字路), ed. by Kaji Nobuyuki Hakase Koki Kinen Ronshuh Kankokkai, pp. 509–523 (in Japanese), Tokyo: Kenbunshuppan (研文出版).
- Arlt, R. and S. Hiyama. 2016. "New Evidence for the Identification of the Figure with a Bow in Depictions of the Buddha's Life in Gandharan Art." *Distant Worlds Journal* 1: 187–205.
- Bachhofer, L. 1937. "Pancika und Hāritī —ΦΑΡΟ und ΑΡΔΟΧΡΟ." *Ostasiatische Zeitschrift* 13: 6–15.
- Behrendt, K. 2005. "Narrative Sequences in the Buddhist Reliefs from Gandhāra." In *South Asian Archaeology 2001*, vol. II, eds. by C. Jarriège and V. Lefèvre, pp. 383–392, Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations.
- Bopearachchi, O. 1991. *Monnaies gréco-bactriennes et indo-grecques*, Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale.
- Callieri, P. 1997. *Seals and Sealings from the North-West of the Indian Subcontinent and Afghanistan (4th century BC – 11th century AD)*, Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli (infra, ISMEO).
- Carter, M. L. 1993. "Museum acquisitions and notes." *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 7: 207–219.
- Coomaraswamy, A. K. 1956. *La Sculpture de Bharhut*, Paris: Vanoest.
- Dagens, B., M. Le Berre and D. Schlumberger. *Monuments préislamiques d'Afghanistan*, Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Dainobu, Y. 1992. "An Iconographical Study of Lokapāla Imagery in and around the Dunhuang Grottoes." *Journal of the Tokyo National Museum* (東京国立博物館紀要) 27: 5–92 (in Japanese).
- Dani, A. "Excavation at Chatpat." *Ancient Pakistan* IV: 65–102, pl. 35-b.
- Dehejia, V. 1997. *Discourse in Early Buddhist Art: Visual Narratives of India*, New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd.
- Dudbridge, G. 1996/97. "The General of the Five Paths in Tang and Pre-Tang China." *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 9: 85–98.
- Dudbridge, G. 2005. "The General of the Five Paths in Tang and Pre-Tang China." In G. Dudbridge, *Books, Tales and Vernacular Culture: Selected Papers on China*, pp. 238–253, Leiden: Brill.
- Faccenna, D. 1985. "Note gandhariche – 2* Sulla ricostruzione di un grande rilievo da Butkara i raffigurante la partenza di Siddhārta da Kapilavastu." In *Orientalia Iosephi Tucci Memoriae Dicata*, eds. by G. Gnoli and L. Lanciotti, vol. I, pp. 325–341, Roma: ISMEO.
- Fischer, K. 1958. "Gandhāran Sculpture from Kunduz and Environs." *Artibus Asiae* XXI: 232–253.
- de Foucaux, P. E. 1888. *Le Lalitavistara*, Paris: Leroux, reprinted in 1988, Paris: Les Deux Océans.
- Foucher, A. 1905. *Les Bas-Reliefs Gréco-Bouddhiques du Gandhāra*, Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- Foucher, A. 1918. *L'Art Gréco-Bouddhique du Gandhāra*, Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- Foucher, A. 1949. *La vie du Bouddha d'après les textes et les monuments de l'Inde*, Paris: Payot.

- Giès, J. and Cohen, M. Sérinde, *Terre de Bouddha*, Paris: Réunion des Musées Nationaux.
- Gnoli, R. 1977. *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu*, Rome: ISMEO.
- Göbl, R. 1984. *Münzprägung des Kušanreiches*, Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Hargreaves, H. 1939. *The Buddha Story in Stone*, Lahore: Central Museum.
- Hirakawa, A. (ed.) 1997. *A Buddhist Chinese-Sanskrit Dictionar* (仏教漢梵大辞典), Tokyo: The Reiyūkai (霊友会).
- Hirai, Y. and R. Ohminami. 2002. *Recension and Annotation of the Foshuo taizi ruiying benqi jing* (太子瑞应本起经) and the *Buddhacarita* (佛所行讚), Tokuyo: Daizō-shuppan (大蔵出版).
- Hiyama, S. 2013. "Study on the First-style Murals of Kucha: Analysis of Some Motifs Related to the Hephthalite's Period." In *Buddhism and Art in Gandhara and Kucha*, Section I, ed. by A. Miyaji, pp. 125–164 (in Japanese), Kyoto: Ryukoku University.
- Hokazono, K. 1994. *A Study on the Lalitavistara* (I), in Japanese, Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha (大東出版社).
- Hokazono, K. 1997. "Study on the *Lalitavistara* (15-vi): Textual criticism and Japanese translation." *The Quarterly Journal of Kagoshima Keizai University* (鹿児島経済大学紀要) 38-3: 59–90 (in Japanese).
- Hokazono, K. 1998. "Study on the *Lalitavistara* (15-vii): Textual criticism and Japanese translation." *The Quarterly Journal of Kagoshima Keizai University* (鹿児島経済大学紀要) 39-2: 21–54 (in Japanese).
- Hunt, M. 1910. *Āṅguttara-Nikāya*, vol. VI, Indexs, reprinted in 2001, Oxford: Pāli Text Society.
- Ikawa, K. 1986. *Four Loka-Pālas* (四天王像), in Japanese, Tokyo: Shibundō (至文堂).
- Ingholt, H. 1957. *Gandhāran Art in Pakistan*, New York: Pantheon Books.
- Izumoji, O. 2007. "Hārītī is the wife of the Great God of the Five Paths." In *Setsuwaronshuh* (説話論集), eds. by A. Ikeda et al., vol.16, pp. 71–97 (in Japanese), Osaka: Seibundō Shuppan (清文堂出版).
- Johne, I. 2003. "Pāñcika oder Pharro?" *Berliner Indologische Studien* 15/16/17: 421–438.
- Jongeward, D. 2003. *Buddhist Art of Pakistan and Afghanistan, The Royal Ontario Museum Collection of Gandhara Sculpture*, Toronto: University of Toronto, The Centre for South Asian Studies.
- Jongeward, D. and J. Cribb. 2015. *Kushan, Kushano-Sasanian, and Kidarite Coins, A Catalogue of Coins from the American Numismatic Society*, New York: The American Numismatic Society.
- Kageyama, E. 2007. "The Winged Crown and the Triple-crescent Crown in the Sogdian Funerary Monuments from China: Their Relation to the Hephthalite Occupation of Central Asia." *Journal of Inner Asian Art and Archaeology* 2: 11–22.
- Karashima, S. 2016. "Indian Folk Etymologies and their Reflections in Chinese Translations—*brāhmaṇa*, *śramaṇa* and *Vaiśravaṇa*." *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advance Buddhism* at Soka University 19: 101–123.
- Karetzky, P. E. 1992. *The Life of the Buddha Ancient Scriptural and Pictorial Traditions*, New York/London: University Press of America.
- Kawano, S. 1991. "Some Problems Pertaining to the Buddha's Life Story in Early Chinese Buddhism—In Relation to the *Xiuxing benqi jing*—(初期中国仏教の仏伝をめぐる諸問題—修行本起經に関連して)." *The Memoirs of the Institute of Oriental Culture* (東洋文化研究所紀要) 113: 127–176 (in Japanese).
- Kurita, I. 2003. *Gandhāran Art The Buddha's Life Story*, in Japanese and English, Tokyo: Nigensha (二玄社).
- Lamotte, E. 1958. *Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien*, Leuven: Institut Orientaliste de l' Université de Louvain.
- Maeda, T. 2014. "The Panel Depicting "The Great Departure Scene of Siddhartha" in the Okayama Orient Museum." *Bulletin of the Okayama Orient Museum* 28: 13–24 (in Japanese).
- Matsuda, Y. 1988. "Chinese Versions of the Buddha's Biography." *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* (印度学佛教学研究) 37-1: 489–480.
- Mori, Sh., T. Motozawa and Sh. Iwai (eds.). 2000. "Sources by Topics of the Buddha's Biographies and Related Documents (仏伝諸経典および仏伝関係諸資料のエピソード別主点要覧)," *A Study of the Biography of Sakya-muni Based on the Early Buddhist Scriptural Sources*, Part 3, Tokyo: Chuō Academic Research Institute (中央学術研究所) (in Japanese).
- Nagahiro, T. 1976. *Yün-kan Cave Temples* (雲崗石窟), Tokyo: Sekaibunkasha (世界文化社).
- Nakamura, H. 1992. *Gautama Buddha*, in Japanese, Tokyo: Shunjyūsha (春秋社).
- Nara National Museum. 1987. *Special Exhibition Bodhisattva*, in Japanese, Nara: Nara National Museum.
- Nattier, J. 2008. *A Guide to the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations. Texts from the Eastern Han 東漢 and Three Kingdoms 三国 Periods*, Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica X, Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University.
- Nicolle, D and A. McBride. 1996. *Sasanian Armies. The Iranian Empire early 3rd to mid-7th centuries AD*, Stockport: Montvert Publications.
- Oda, Y. 1976. "A Study on the great God of the Five Paths (五道大神攷)." *Oriental Religion* (東方宗教) 48: 14–29 (in Japanese).
- Oda, Y. 1997. "On the Great God of the Five Paths appearing in the lists of tomb burials from Turfan (吐魯番出土の随葬衣物疏)." *Journal of Oriental History* (東洋史苑) 48/49: 10–30 (in Japanese).

- Okano, K. 1990. "A Study on the 普曜經 (part II)." *Bunka* (文化) 53-3/4: 268–243 (in Japanese).
- Quagliotti, A.M. 2003. "An Image in the Indian Museum with Some Considerations on the Tutelary Couples in Gandharan Art." *Silk Road Art and Archaeology* 9: 239–296.
- Quagliotti, A.M. 2005. "Puer Mingens, The Tutelary Couple and Connected Problems: A Gandharan Relief in the Royal Ontario Museum." In *Art et archéologie des monastères gréco-bouddhiques du Nord-Ouest de l'Inde et de l'Asie centrale*, ed. by Z. Tarzi and D. Vaillancourt, pp. 123–162, Paris: De Boccard.
- Rahman, A.U. and H. Falk. 2011. *Seals, Sealings and Tokens from Gandhāra*, Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.
- Rickenbach, J. 1989. *Oxus 2000 Jahre Kunst am Oxus-Fluss in Mittelasien*, Zürich: Museum Riedberg Zürich.
- Rosenfield, J. M. 1967. *The Dynastic Arts of the Kushans*, Berkeley/ Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Sadakata, A. 2002. "On the offering of food by the two merchants to the Buddha." *The Bulletin of the Faculty of Letters of Tokai University* (東海大学紀要文学部) 76: 120–77 (in Japanese).
- Siklós, B. 1996. "The Evolution of the Buddhist Yama." In *The Buddhist Forum*, vol. IV, ed. by T. Skorupski, pp. 165–189, London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
- Tanabe, K. 1993/94. "Neither Māra nor Indra but Vaiśravaṇa in Scenes of the Great Departure of Prince Siddhārtha—Origins of the Tobatsubishamonten Image (兜跋毘沙門天像の起源)—" *Silk Road Art and Archaeology* 3: 157–185.
- Tanabe, K. 1997/98. "The Goddess of Night in the Gandharan Great Departure Scene of Siddhārtha." *Silk Road Art And Archaeology* 5: 215–232.
- Tanabe, K. 1999/2000. "King Huvishka and the emergence of Vaiśravaṇa images in Gandharan art." *Silk Road Art and Archaeology* 6: 119–127.
- Tanabe, K. 2006. *The Origin of the Vaiśravaṇa Image*, in Japanese, Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin (山喜房佛書林).
- Tanabe, K. 2016. "Iconographical Studies on Gandharan Art (12) Structural Analysis of Mahāparinirvāṇa Relief Panels—Focusing on the Buddha's Reclining Posture—." *Bulletin of the Ancient Museum* XXXVI: 57–88 (in Japanese).
- Tanabe, K. and K. Maeda. 1999. *Central Asia*, vol. 15 of *New History of World Art*, Tokyo: Shogakukan (小学館) (in Japanese).
- Teiser, S. F. 1994. *The Scripture on the Ten Kings and the Making of Purgatory in Medieval Chinese Buddhism*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Trenckner, V. 1888. *The Majjhima-Nikāya*, vol. I, reprinted in 2002, Oxford: The Pāli Text Society.
- Trousdale, W. 1975. *The Long Sword and Scabbard Slide in Asia*, Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Ueeda, I. 2016. "Study on the Buddha's Life Story relief panels arranged along the stupa-drum of Gandhara." In *Central Asia I* (中央アジア I), ed. by A. Miyaji, pp. 137–165, Tokyo: Chūōkōron bijutsu shuppan (中央公論美術出版) (in Japanese).
- Wilcox, P. and A. McBride. 1986. *Rome's Enemies (3): Parthian & Sasanian Persians*, London: Osprey Publishing.
- Yasuda, H. 2000. *Buddhist Sculptures from Gandhara* (ガンダーラの彫像), Tokyo: Nezu Museum of Art (根津美術館) (in Japanese).
- Yūrinkan. 1996. *Master Pieces of Yūrinkan* (有鄰館精華), in Japanese, Kyoto: Yūrinkan Museum of Art (有鄰館).
- Zheng, A. 2009. "Development of the Cult of the General of the Five Paths in Tang and Five Dynasty Periods Focusing on Dunhuang Manuscripts and Figures (唐五代“五道將軍”信仰之發展—以敦煌文獻圖像為核心—)." *Zhongguo su wenhua yanjiu* (中国俗文化研究) 5: 1–17 (in Chinese).
- Zheng, A. 2013. "Investigation of the Origin and Imagery of the Dharmacakra King of the Five Paths in the Cult of Ten Kings (經典、文学与図像—十王信仰中「五道轉輪王」来源与形像之考察)." *Dunhuangxue* (敦煌学, Studies on Dun-huang) 30: 183–200 (in Chinese).

Fig. 1. Great Departure, detail of Fig. 2.



Fig. 2. Great Departure, Nimogram, H: 11cm, Musée Guimet, Paris.



PLATE 12

Fig. 3. First Meditation, Nimogram, H:18cm, Swat Museum.



Fig. 4. Great Departure and Farewell to Kaṇṭhaka, H: 9cm, Nara National Museum, Nara.



Fig. 5. Pāñcika, H: 54cm, Peshawar Museum.



Fig. 6. Pāñcika/Pharro and Hārītī/Ardoxsho, H:18cm, Asiatische Museum, Berlin.



Fig. 7. Great Departure, H:ca.30cm, National Museum of Pakistan, Karachi.



Fig. 8. Galloping Parthian cavalier, H: 17cm, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin.



Fig. 9. Vajrapāṇi, H: 33cm, Sen-oku-hakuko-kan (泉屋博古館), Kyoto.



PLATE 14

Fig. 10. Great Departure, H: ca.20cm, National Museum of Pakistan, Karachi.



Fig. 11. Great Departure, H: 38cm, Indian Museum, Kolkata.



Fig. 12. Vasudeva, gold dinar, D: 2cm, British Museum, London.



Fig. 13. Great Departure, H: 21cm, Victoria & Albert Museum, London.



PLATE 16

Fig. 14. Donation of Four Bowls to the Buddha by the Four Lokapālas, H; 45cm, Hirayama Ikuo Silk Road Museum, Hokuto, Japan.



Fig. 15. Pharro, god dinar of Huvishka, D: 2cm, Hamana-konpō-yusō Silk Road Museum, Iwata, Japan.

